DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 477 SP 032 474

AUTHOR O'Loughlin, Michael
TITLE Teachers' Ways of Knowing: A Journal Study of Teacher Learning in a Dialogical and Constructivist Learning Environment.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beliefs; Dialog Journals; *Epistemology; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Journal Writing; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Empowerment; Freire (Paulo); *Reflective Teaching

ABSTRACT

Research suggests that the formal socialization teachers receive in teacher education programs may be the least influential factor in determining their beliefs about teaching and pedagogical practice. The beliefs prospective teachers have developed about teaching as a result of their long immersion as students in the culture of schooling appear to have a profound influence on the way they teach and the way they think about teaching. The majority of teachers and prospective teachers initially demonstrate a tremendous resistance to the notion that students possessing a sense of agency can be empowered to take responsibility for constructing their own understanding and, ultimately, determining the direction of their own lives. It is argued that teachers' beliefs are culturally constructed ideological systems, frequently unconsciously held, pervading their entire ways of knowing and acting, not just their explicit philosophies of teaching and learning. This fundamental resistance to reflective teaching is illustrated with extensive excerpts from a professor's reflective journal about students in an inservice teacher education class. The method used in this class was Paulo Freire's approach to critical pedagogy which attempts to enable teachers to develop more enriched ways of knowing, a more empowered sense of agency, and more progressive pedagogical beliefs. The course syllabus is appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED327477

Teachers' ways of knowing: A journal study of tea cher learning in a dialogical and constructivist learning environment

Michael O'Loughlin

Hofstra University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. O'Loughlin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 032 474

Prepared for the invited symposium Semiotic teaching methods: A critical analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 16-20, 1990.

Please note: This paper represents work in progress. Please do not quote. Comments welcome and appreciated. Author's address: Dept. of Curriculum & Teaching, 208 Mason Hall, Hofstra

University, Hempstead, N. Y. 11550. (516) 560 5792.

How do teachers come to know about pedagogy? Research that I have summarized in another paper to be presented at this conference suggests that the formal socialization teachers receive in teacher education programs is probably the **least** influential factor in determining teachers' beliefs about teaching and their practice of pedagogy. As I note in that paper (O'Loughlin, 1990), research by Britzman (1986) and others suggests that the beliefs prospective teachers have developed about teaching as a result of their long immersion as students in the culture of schooling appear to have a profound influence on the way they teach and the way they think about teaching. Furthermore, I have found from my own experience that when I expose preservice and inservice teachers in my university classes to the richness of possibility inherent in thinking of students as possessing a **sense of agency** - as people who can be empowered to take responsibility for constructing their own understanding and ultimately for determining the direction of their own lives - the majority of teachers and prospective teachers initially demonstrate a tremendous resistance to this liberatory notion of education.

From my own reading, from listening to my students' voices in journals, in autobiograhies and in class, and from reflecting and writing about my own attempts to teach reflectively (O'Loughlin, 1988a, 1989b; O'Loughlin & Campbell, 1988) I have come to realize that this resistance comes from a fundamental conflict of visions between the possibility of education that I hold forth and **the way my students know education to be**. As I and others have argued (for review see O'Loughlin, 1989a, 1990), it appears that many teachers espouse authoritarian and didactic teaching philosophies and practices because that is how they themselves were taught and they know no other way of construing pedagogy. Consequently, one of the major obstacles we face in advancing a progressive or reformist agenda in teacher education may be **teachers' and prospective teachers' unexamined beliefs about knowing, teaching and learning**.

The formulation I have presented is good as far as it goes, and it may be generally accurate, but it is not unproblematic. For one thing, the term "teacher belief" brings to mind images of a coherent, consciously held body of information or opinion as to the nature of pedagogy. To the contrary, I will argue momentarily that teachers' beliefs are more in the nature of culturally constructed ideological systems which are frequently unconsciously held, and which pervade teachers' entire ways of knowing and acting and not just their explicit philosophies of teaching, learning and knowing. Furthermore, rather than the homogeneous coherence and cohesiveness implied in the term "teacher belief", it may well be that

teachers' beliefs can be characterized more accurately by their dilemmatic and dialectical characteristics (cf. Billig et al., 1988). Finally, I am also uneasy about positing a simple linear relationship between a unitary notion of teacher belief and the subsequent actions of teachers in classrooms. Can we really reduce the necessarily complex and dilemmatic decision-making of classroom teachers to such simple causal relationships? Or could it be the case, perhaps, that in seeing teachers' beliefs through our own socially constructed "scientific" or "research" lenses that we choose to represent it this simply? In doing so, I fear we may do little justice either to the complex subjectivities of teachers, or to the delicate interplay of processes involved either in the social construction of belief systems, or in the relationship between espoused beliefs and subsequent actions.

In other papers of mine, including the one to be presented at this conference (O'Loughlin, 1989, 1990; O'Loughlin & Campbell, 1988) I have attempted to explore the formal structural properties of teacher belief, and I have attempted to outline the kind of programmatic research that needs to be undertaken in this area. Missing from those papers, however, is any attempt to delineate the phenomenological characteristics of "teacher belief". Such a description is necessary, however, if we are to understand how such beliefs originate, if we are to identify what the characteristics of teacher belief might be, and if we are to assess how best to go about inducing change in belief. I would like to redress the balance in this paper by presenting a qualitative analysis of the processes underlying what I refer to as "teacher belief". My goal here - drawing upon the literature that has influenced me, and upon cases from my own teaching - is to attempt to illustrate the complex subjective and cultural processes underlying the seemingly reassuring term "teacher belief", and to indicate how, by understanding the meaning-making processes - or **semiosis** - in which teachers engage, we can develop pedagogical strategies that enable teachers to become reflective empowered knowers who can experience a sense of agency and possibility, and who can, as a result, engage their students in a similar process of coming to know for themselves.

Teacher beliefs: The effects of an ideological system

Before exploring the processes by which teacher beliefs are constructed and deconstructed, it may be helpful to examine some of the concrete ways in which teachers beliefs present themselves to us in teacher education. For illustrative purposes, consider the situation for undergraduate students who have begun to take education courses with a view to earning certification as teachers. My own experience teaching the

first education course that undergraduates take has left me convinced that many - if not all - education majors enter college with very specific views of the nature and purpose of pedagogy, with very clearly established ways of knowing, and with very specific beliefs about the locus of authority and knowledge. More formally, my observations and the informal date I have garnered from reading my students' learning autobiographies and journals, and from talking with them in class and in conferences, suggest that student teachers possess **an ideological system** which includes **an epistemological orientation** [i.e., a way of knowing], **an authority orientation** [i.e., the presence or absence of a sense of agency and empowerment], and a set of **implicit and explicit beliefs about pedagogy.** Although I am not yet in a position to present data to support the scheme which follows in its entirety[1], my observations are consistent with Perry's (1970) findings on epistemological and intellectual development, as well as Britzman's (1986) recent findings with respect to the nature of student teachers' beliefs.

First, with respect to **epistemological orientation**, I find that when my students and I first meet they often exhibit **ways of knowing** that are quite consistent with the following description, compiled recently by my colleague Roberta Ahlquist and I. My undergraduate students typically . . .

*** focus only on rote learning and memorization**
*** look only for "right answers"**
*** read superfically - never struggle for deeper meaning**
*** usually read something only once**
*** perceive reading and writing as mechanical tasks**
*** have difficulty expresssing themselves in writing**
*** have difficulty making oral arguments cogently**
*** are extremely grade-oriented**
*** seem to care only about "what's on the test"**
*** want information to be dispensed to them**
*** perceive the teacher and textbook as absolute sources of knowledge**
*** think dualistically - a point of view is either right or it is wrong**
*** have difficulty detaching themselves from their own perspectives to see other points of view**
*** become very anxious in the presence of ambiguity and uncertainty**
*** are fearful of risk-taking**
*** are oriented toward finding "the right answer"**

and solving problems as opposed to posing problems
* **often suffer from a fundamental absence of voice and critical stance**

[From Ahlquist & O'Loughlin, (ms.), 1990]

Second, with respect to **authority orientation**, although my students are young adults who are presumably engaged in the process of defining the direction of their future, I find them often troublingly lacking in a **sense of agency** or control of their own destinies. Ahlquist and I argue that the following characteristics are not uncommon among the undergraduates we teach:

* **students lack a sense of voice - they are unwilling to speak or participate in class**
* **they are unaware that their lives and their learning are influenced by autobiographical and historical experiences**
* **they have learned not to trust their own experience, nor do they see experience as the starting point in learning**
* **they lack empowerment - they are so convinced that the "world is the way it is" that they are unable to go beyond this to contemplate possibility or change**
* **they never question the decisions or practices of their professors, nor the purpose or value of the courses they take**
* **they depend on their professors for guidance even for the simplest decisions, e.g., "How long should the paper be?"; "Should it be typed?"; "Which chapter should I read?'; "Will it be on the test?".**
* **they lack self-awareness and thus they depend on the professor to tell them how they're doing.**
* **they lack political awareness both of oppression in the world and within themselves resulting from race, sex or social class bias.**
* **In the words of Ann Berlak, they show little <u>empathy</u> for oppressed persons, nor <u>outrage</u> at their own or others' oppression**

*** in summary, they lack a sense of agency, never experiencing the sense of mastery that comes from knowing that they can know and act for themselves to control their own destiny**

[From Ahlquist & O'Loughlin, (ms.), 1990]

These beliefs about themselves, about their knowing, and about the sources of authority and knowledge appear to be quite deep-seated and resistant to change. Ahlquist and I have found , for example, that when we expose students with these belief characteristics to ways of knowing that are designed to allow them to experience the possibility of empowerment that comes from constructing their own understanding, many students **initially** react by . . .

*** showing tremendous fear and anxiety**
*** avoiding risk-taking**
*** resisting new ideas, and wanting to cling to old ideas**
*** crying out for direction and guidance**
*** complaining about ambiguity and uncertainty**
*** worrying about grades now that the rules have changed**
*** complaining that the teacher is arbitrary or unfair**
*** devoting lots of energy to reading the teacher's mind in order to succeed**
*** trying desperately to please the teacher in order to get a "good grade"**

[From Ahlquist & O'Loughlin, (ms.) 1990]

Finally, with respect to **implicit and explicit beliefs about pedagogy**, my students typically reveal a strong bias in favor of didactic approaches to teaching. They typically perceive the teacher as the source of knowledge. They believe that the teacher's role is to transmit the received view of knowledge, and that a student's role is to accept and master the necessary information without question. Typically, they also identify concern about the establishment and maintenance of authority and control in the classroom as their primary preoccupation. These impressions are consistent with the findings from Britzman's study of the beliefs of student teachers. Britzman (1986) argues, on the basis of her data that the accumulated images of teaching, learning and knowing that are embodied in student teachers' beliefs, cause them to reproduce the

authoritarian and didactic modes of teaching with which they are so familiar from their own school experiences:

> **Prospective teachers, then, bring to their teacher education more than their desire to teach. they bring their implicit institutional biographies - the cumulative experience of school lives which, in turn, inform their knowledge of the student's world, of school structure, and of curriculum . . .**
> **I argue that the underlying values which coalesce in one's institutional biography, if unexamined, propel the cultural reproduction of authoritarian teaching practices and naturalize the contexts which generate such a cycle" (p. 443).**

The reason I refer to teacher belief as an **"ideological system"** is because a considerable amount of consistency is evident across the epistemological orientation, the orientation toward authority , and the implicit and explicit pedagogical beliefs undergraduate student teachers hold. Undergraduates often possess a very narrow epistemological orientation, one that often amounts to little more than unquestioning acquiescence to the received view of knowledge. Often, too, they exhibit an orientation toward authority that indicates a desire to conform and satisfy external authority, with a concomitant diminution of their own sense of agency and empowerment. Finally, from what we know of student teachers' implicit and explicit pedagogical beliefs, it appears that they entertain notions of pedagogy that are quite consistent with their epistemological and authority orientations, namely that schooling is intrinsically didactic and authoritarian in nature. What this suggests, therefore, is that **teachers' implicit and explicit pedagogical beliefs represent just the surface of a much deeper ideological system which includes deep-seated ways of thinking about epistemology and authority.** I will argue, momentarily, that this ideology has its roots in people's construction of selves in interaction with the cultural and institutional norms of society, particularly with respect to the location of authority and knowledge. Consequently, if we are to understand "teacher beliefs" and their potential for change, it is important that we examine the meaning-making processes involved in this process of ideology formation.

Teacher beliefs: The construction of an ideology

Useful insights into the operation of the enculturation processes which underlie the formation of the kind of ideology of interest here are to be found in the writings of Paulo Freire, and particularly in Pedagogy of the oppressed (1972/1989)[2]. In that book Freire, drawing upon his own experience of teaching literacy as a vehicle for personal empowerment and social transformation among poor, illiterate peasants in Brazil, argues that the key to liberatory education is a thorough understanding of the processes of enculturation which socialize people to see the world only from within a given perspective. Freire begins by defining as oppressive any situation in which people **"have been unjustly deprived of their voice" (p. 35)** and **"hindered in the pursuit of self-affirmation" (p. 38).** This occurs, Freire says, whenever people are made the object of prescriptive or didactic instruction by others. Freire says that this objectification leads to alienation, and eventually to a lack of agency and the development of an orientation toward epistemology which locates the source of all authority outside of the individual:

> **"They call themselves ignorant and say the 'professor' is the one who has the knowledge and to whom they should listen... Almost never do they realize that they, too, know things" (1989, p. 50).**

Freire argues that contrary to promoting a sense of critical consciousness and a sense of agency among students, traditional didactic education - or banking education, as he terms it - is designed to reinforce student passivity so that students become willing to conform without question to the received view - the only vision of reality that is presented to them. Freire suggests that people, never having been allowed the opportunity to become aware that knowledge is socially constructed and that reality is a process in constant state of transformation, accept the received view fatalistically as **known reality**, and become passive, dependent, alienated and hopeless. Oppressed persons, therefore, are deprived not only of the opportunity to engage in sense-making or knowledge construction activites for themselves, but they are not even made aware that knowledge is socially constructed and that any version of reality represents an ideological construction. Thus they are fundamentally deprived of the sense of agency which would enable them to think for themselves, to examine their own lives, and to identify and work toward achieving imagined possibilities.

Freire's explanation of the operation of antidialogical education sheds further light on the processes by which people are not only prevented from considering other world-views, but by which they are co-opted to reproduce the oppressive education of which they themselves are victims. Chief among these processes is a conscious intent to **mythicize reality** by

giving rationales which convince people that the received view is the best of all possible worlds, and the only logically available option. The demonizing in which politicians engage (e.g., Ronald Reagan's invocation of The Evil Empire to personify the Soviet Union) is a commonplace example of the use of this strategy in the public domain. Another strategy is **"to anaesthetize the people so that they will not think" (p. 146).** Freire argues that welfare programs, for example, act as an anaesthetic **"because they distract people from the true causes of their problems, and from concrete solutions to these problems" (p. 144).** A third strategy is cultural invasion, in which the culture and values of the invaded group are so negated that the victims experience a sense of **"cultural inauthenticity"** and eventually they **"come to see reality with the outlook of the invaders rather than their own" (p. 150).** The result, for the invaded, is a profound sense of inferiority and alienation from self. Freire argues that home and school, being socially constructed institutions, are designed to ensure the reproduction of the received view, and thus they are often essentially authoritarian in character in order to ensure the requisite **conformity** from young people. By mandating conformity, institiutions such as family and school preclude the possibility for critical thought or the construction of alternate realities. Freire says that through prolonged exposure to the mandates of conformity young people internalize a belief in the value of and necessity for conformity, and later, when they become professionals, they tend to **"...repeat the rigid patterns in which they were educated" (p. 153).** It is thus that the received view continues its cycle of reproduction. Freire sums up the entire process by which people are socialized into a single, pre-ordained reality, as follows:

> **Cultural invasion, which serves the end of conquest and the preservation of oppression, always involves a parochial view of reality, a static perception of the world, and the imposition of one worldview upon another. It implies the 'superiority' of the invader and the 'inferiority' of those who are invaded, as well as the imposition of values by the former, who possess the latter and are afraid of losing them" (p. 159).**

Since, as I have noted earlier, many of my students suffer from a diminished sense of personal agency and since they have very limited awareness of epistemological or pedagogical possibilities, I am quite persuaded that they are victims of oppression in Freire's sense. They have been deprived of the opportunity to understand the socially constructed nature of reality and knowledge, and deprived too of an opportunity to

realize that they too might engage in the construction of reality and the transformation of their worlds.

Teacher beliefs: The deconstruction of an ideology

Freire's fundamental concern centers around the dialectical tension between oppression and liberation. The issue for Freire is how to arrive at a pedagogy that will allow people to become **"masters of their thinking"** so that they may engage in **"action and reflection...upon their world in order to transform it" (p. 66).** Since Freire recognizes the enculturation of a single, dominant view of reality as the central cause of oppression, it follows that his solution involves examining ways in which to enable people to **de-ideologize or deconstruct known reality** so that it becomes available as an object of critical reflection, and so that people may go beyond it to imagine other possible worlds and to work towards their realization.

In addressing issues of instruction, Freire focuses specifically on the lived experience of people and the means by which they encode reality:

> **Many persons, bound to a mechanistic view of reality, do not perceive that the concrete situation of men conditions their consciousness of the world, and that in turn this consciousness conditions their attitudes and their ways of dealing with reality (p. 124).**
>
> **The object of the investigation is not men, but rather the thought-language with which men refer to reality, the levels at which they perceive that reality, and their view of the world in which their generative themes are found (p. 86).**

Since, as noted earlier, traditional banking education attempts to mythicize reality, the goal of this alternative **problem-posing pedagogy** is to **"strive to unveil reality, unmask its mythicization" (p. 92).** Freire argues that it is only when people can become detached from the view of reality within which they are submerged that they can develop the capacity to treat that reality as an object of reflection . The process of interest here is essentially a **decoding of reality** in which people are enabled to recognize that meaning and reality are not static or fixed, but rather that reality is socially constructed and capable of transformation. This process is necessarily empowering because people who previously felt hopeless in the face of a given reality that they perceived as unchangeable

now begin to have the capacity to think in terms of overcoming reality in order to achieve newly imagined possibilities:

> **Individuals who were submerged in reality, merely feeling their needs, emerge from reality and come to perceive the causes of their needs. In this way, they can go beyond the level of real consciousness to that of potential consciousness much more rapidly (p. 110).**

Freire argues that for this process to succeed it is essential to situate pedagogy within the lived experience of people's lives. He says that people's views, "**impregnated with anxieties, doubts, hopes or hopelessness, imply significant themes on the basis of which the program content of education can be built" (p. 82).** Sometimes, he says, people may be so submerged within a given reality that they become unable to detach themselves from their reality in order to treat it as an object of reflection. Freire argues that their ensuing **silence** is a critical theme manifesting the presence of deep oppression. In such cases, Freire recommends that the teacher develop abstract codifications - for example, by means of pictures - which capture some of the essential themes of the codification of their reality. These pictures can then be used as a way to introduce the people to the process of naming, objectifying and reflecting on the cultural construction of their reality and what it means. Once the people have become comfortable naming their experience in a safe and trusting atmosphere, the role of the teacher is to problematize that reality so that it becomes the object of critical reflection:

> **The starting point... must be the present, existential, concrete situation, reflecting the basic aspirations of the people. Utilizing certain basic contradictions, we must pose this existential concrete situation to the people as a problem which challenges them (p. 85).**

Through this problematization the teacher **re-presents** their taken-for-granted experiences to students so they come to view them as problematic. Students and teacher then join together as **"critical co-investigators" (p. 68)** to examine and to reflect critically upon elements of their experience through **problem-posing dialogue**. Freire suggests that once aspects of experience become the object of critical reflection they also become available as objects which people can act upon, thus leading to the kind of transformative action on reality that Freire refers to as **praxis.**

Turning from the general schematic presented by Freire, to the specific problem of teachers' ideological systems, what implications does

Freire's analysis have for enabling teachers to develop more enriched ways of knowing, a more empowered sense of agency, and ultimately more progressive pedagogical beliefs? I have been working for a number of years now to reinvent Freire's approach to critical pedagogy in a teacher education context in order to address these issues. An idealized version of the process that I attempt to use in my teaching is presented in the diagram in Table 1. As the diagram reveals a central focus is on the generative themes of students' lives, including of course students' **epistemological and authority orientations**. These themes may be elicited directly form students or by means of abstract codifications which allow them to reflect critically on their culturally formed reality. Surrounding this central focus, and represented by the terms and arrows on the periphery in Table 1, are a series of **interacting pedagogical processes** which are designed to allow students to move from an unconscious submersion in the received view to a critically conscious and empowered vision of educational possibility. Since I have explicated these processes at length elsewhere (e.g., O'Loughlin, 1988a, b, 1989b; Ahlquist & O'Loughlin, 1990), what follows is a very brief overview:

Voice: The most essential purpose of acknowledging student voice is to affirm that each of our students is a **knowing subject** - a person who enters the classroom with ideas and attitudes which represent that individual's current best way of knowing and construing the world. Fundamentally, to acknowledge voice is to accept the **constructivist** notion that each individual **knows** and can come to **know more** through her or his own sense-making processes. It is also an affirmation of the diverse cultures, languages and perspectives that our students hold, and consequently it is an affirmation of the personhood and potential of each individual.

Storytelling & Dialogue: Through narrating, sharing, writing and reflecting on their own personal histories, and on their own lived experiences of the cultural process of schooling, students begin to develop a sense of the influence of **social, autobiographical and historical forces** in their own formation, and also, from their participation in dialogue, they begin to experience - many for the first time - a sense of **selves as knowers and makers of history** rather than just as passive absorbers of someone else's received truth.

Naming reality: Through this consciousness raising and sharing students begin to realize that there are **reasons why they are the way they are**, i.e., why they possess the ways of knowing and sense of agency they are ruled by. This acknowledging and naming of reality is a major step toward

critical consciousness.

Problem-posing & dialogue about reality: At this point the teacher's role is to **problematize reality** for the students so that they come to think of taken-for-granted reality in a critical manner. Maxine Greene (1988) refers to this process as **defamiliarizing the commonplace**, and Ira Shor (1987) likewise refers to it as the process of **extraordinarily reexperiencing the ordinary.** A critical part of this process is classroom **dialogue** in which students and teacher come together to collaborate in demystifying taken-for-granted perceptions.

Exposure to multiple possibilities: An essential component of **empowerment**, as well as a critical requirement in order to escape from the tyranny of **dualism** - in which only one point of view is acknowledged - is to be able to imagine and critically evaluate a variety of possibilities. Consequently, students need to be exposed to a variety of critical and nontraditional perspectives on educational issues.

Renaming reality & Critical consciousness: The goal is to have students come to **rename reality** - to see a much more complex, socially constructed reality, a reality **in process of transformation,** where before they had perceived only a single, fixed and given reality.

Empowered action to transform reality: It is through the cumulative effects of all of the foregoing - development of ways of knowing; development of a sense of agency; critical reflection on the received view; construction and critical reflection on alternate possibilities - that students can begin to develop the sense of empowerment that will cause them to believe that the world **need not be the way it is**, and that **they have the power** to influence the direction and nature of change.

A cautionary note! While there are some hierarchical assumptions underlying the sequence presented in Table 1, bidirectional arrows have been used purposely to indicate the **interactive and iterative** nature of the processes under discussion here.

Teachers' beliefs: From ideal to practice

I noted earlier that the process depicted in Table 1 is an **ideal-ization**. It is much easier to discuss this kind of pedagogy in principle than in practice because in practice the material depicted in the central oval in Table 1, namely the generative themes and issues of students' lived

experiences, has a habit of being **much less predictable and tractable** than what the idealization might suggest. In my own pedagogy I have been gradually moving in the direction of the idealization represented by Table 1. In a recent summer, I was scheduled to teach two graduate classes, one of **preservice master's degree students** and one of **inservice [practising] teachers** who were taking master's degree courses to attain permanent state certification. I decided to use the opportunity to make a determined advance in my own practise of pedagogy by focusing much more on storytelling and autobiographical reflection, by attempting to elicit generative themes from students, and by developing an **emergent curriculum** as each class unfolded.

Each of my classes met four days a week for about two hours, for a full month. The preservice class enrolled twenty four students, while the inservice class enrolled eleven students. Classes met in very hot mornings in July-August in rooms without airconditioning. I did not taperecord the classroom discussion, although I did take occassional notes, and after my four hours of class each day I spent at least an hour typing up a journal in which I reflected on the course of my teaching. By the end of the month I had accumulated in excess of thirty single-spaced pages of commentary, and this, along with occasional writings from students constitute the corpus of data from which I am currently preparing a case study of my teaching. Although that work is still in progress, I would like to share some extracts from my journal, since they offer some interesting insights into the challenges of teaching acording to the mandates suggested in Table 1. I should note that my students were aware of my journaling activity and all material mentioned in the following discussion appears with permission. Names and other clues have been removed to protect individual students' identiities and rights of privacy.

The syllabus: The course syllabus was largely identical for both classes, since both groups were taking a required course in child development in school context. The syllabus for one class, which is attached as Appendix A, is largely self-explanatory, though the following brief notes, keyed to the headings in the syllabus, may add clarification:

* The required texts are all trade paperbacks, and each is explicitly constructivist and student-centered in focus.

* The statement of purpose in the syllabus makes explicit the **construct-ivist** basis of the course

* The format of the course statement makes clear the dialogical and critical philosophy of the course, and underscores the learner's

responsibility for engaging in growth and meaningful learning. It also makes clear my commitment to a relevant curriculum and to the provision of a supportive, caring atmosphere for students.

* As the notes under the topic of course schedule indicate, this was my first attempt at setting up a **collaborative** learning environment in which we, as a community of learners, would take joint responsibility for the direction of our studies. Recognizing the difficulty this is likely to present, a possible starting plan is suggested.

* Again, anticipating that students unschooled in this philosophy might find it difficult to develop suitable assignments - particularly under the pressure of an accelerated summer schedule - a number of assignments are suggested. These include a reflective journal, two pieces of autobiographical writing, a problem-posing exercise with respect to some reading, and a final project that requires students to engage in **collaborative inquiry and teaching**; that requires a demonstration of **ownership of some of the constructivist ideas** discussed in the class; and that requires that students engage the issue of **bridging the gap between the theoretical notions** of constructivism discussed in class and **the practice of teaching.**

The journal: In the brief extracts which follow I will focus mainly on the inservice class, mentioning the preservice class only for purposes of comparison. Students in the preservice class responded readily to the syllabus and the experience was exhilirating. The opposite was the case with the inservice class. However, I think more is to be gained from studying the latter. Extracts from the journal will be presented without additional commentary, since the journal notes are self-explanatory.

THE JOURNAL

DAY 1

... I am espcially interested in genuinely trying to ground the curiculum in student exp., and to genuinely serve the role of a problem poser & catalyst for critical reflection. In thinking about summer school, I made a major departure from typical form, and resolved to drop the formal syllabus, and to introduc a significant amount of autobiographical writing into my assignments. In thinking ahead to my classes I looked forward with pleasure to the inservice class, with only 11 enrolled, and I am not so enthused about my the preservice class, with 24 enrolled.

On that first day of class, I had students in each class put their all into

writing for a full hour on the 13 questions that I presented to them about their pedagogical beliefs. After that, there was only time to introduce the books etc., but no real discussion of the syllabus was possible. I got vibes that students in both classes were enthusiastic though as they left.

DAY 2

The preservice class people seemed genuinely enthused about the syllabus. Not one complaint. They just jumped in with a whole bunch of Qs about where to go from here. In fact, to my surprise, when I suggested that the syllabus might bear discussion, they broke up into spontaneous groups, and discussion just flew.

I approached the inservice class with a similar expectation. When I went in, I blithely asked if they had any comments on the syllabus. They had! Apparently they had caucused about this before class and they launched into a very powerful attack on the assignments. Complaints were focused on the amount of work, but my sense is that there was considerable performance anxiety too. I was quite resistant! I felt they just didn't want to read or write! However, I listened patiently for an hour, but refused to back down.... My overall impression was (1) a strong desire to gain practical things - they were happpy to discuss in class, but very reluctant to read or write. I'm not exactly sure wha this means, and to what degree I should respond to felt needs, and to what extent I should stretch them in an intellectual direction. They were also very concerned about the ambiguity and lack of structure. (2) I feel a real need for therapy here. Many of these people don't feel good about themeselves or their skills, and fele very pained when given the opportunity to exmaine themselves.

DAY 3

Today, on a fit of inspiration, I brought in Freire's "The act of study", and posed a set of questions. The discussion in the preservice class was dramatic. They studied, discussed in pairs, then in fours, then we had a talk circle, and shared. I was astonished at the degree of success many of them had in (1) distilling Freire's message; (2) seeing how it connected with the practice of teaching.

I took the same Freire piece into the inservice class. Talk about night & day! Most of them studied it incredibly superficially. Amazingly, despite Freire's insistence that we all reread difficult text to decode it, none of this group felt that was necessary. They simply castigated him for obtuse language. Consequently, it was really impossible to have a serious text analysis, though I did model one for them at the end, so that they might get some idea of how to proceed with the reading. They did however agree that the main message was that learning ought not be passive; that it must build on experience and that you have to read critically. In talking about their own

exps. it was obvious that they have been schooled very didactically. The real question is how do they now teach? Some of them admitted that they literally knew of no other way to study a text like this, since their whole exp. had been based on rote learning and memorization. After this exp. I am convinced that a difficult but pertinent piece like the Freire one is very valuable for consciousness raising and for opportunities for reflection on learning by doing. They would be very happy to please me and give me what I want - I suspect that much of their agony comes from the fact that I refuse to be precise enough to allow them to do just that. Finally, since the first assignment (learning biography) was a source of great anxiety for them) we talked a lot about it, and I gave a fairly extensive account of my own biography as well as reading Matt Groening ["school is hell" cartoons]. I think, after that, they began to see it as a feasible assignment.

DAY 4

On another fit of last-minute inspiration, I asked them (the preservice class) to draw their visual image of the"process of learning". Again, I was not disappointed. They came up with a wide ranging set of interesting abstract conceptualizations of the nature of the process. Many volunteered to come to the board and the others questioned readily....

I was somewhat apprehensive taking the same assignment into the inservice class. When I went in they said they were discussing their biographies before I arrived, and it was fun, and perhaps they should do it for the whole class, that it would be more fun than talking about Duckworth. I REALLY HAVE TO GRAPPLE WITH THIS ISSUE - THE CHOICE BETWEEN WHAT THEY SEE AS THEIR NEEDS, AND MY DESIRE TO PROMOTE A CERTAIN KIND OF CRITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND INTELLECTUALISM. Anyway, I plunged ahead and gave the assignment. I was chagrined. Virtually all of them drew extremely concrete representations of classrooms, with the focus on concrete details. No abstract circles & arrows here. However, to my surprise, they were all very happy to go up and illustrate what their drawings meant, and this turned out to be a very productive and emotionally releasing session for the women. The first one up, C, I think, drew a traditional didactic class - said that was OUT - and then drew an interactive classroom setting. Very literal, learning centers etc. Her explication was that it was necessary for children to share and talk in order to get new ideas. What the drawings ended up as, I believe, were sketches of THEIR IDEAL-REAL CLASSROOMS. When the next one went up, and completed a similar contemporary sketch, P suggested the need to add a "time-out" corner. This provoked an interesting digression into motivation and discipline, which eventually I curtailed.... (1) For the first time I feel I finally allowed a group of teachers to DEVELOP A GENERATIVE THEME. This stuff was REAL for these teachers. They were emotionally involved, they were vulnerable, very mutually supportive, and they were trying to express

and examine a painful segment of their lived reality - AND LARGELY DOING IT FOR THEMSELVES!! (2) I feel that classroom communication evolved to the point that it became obvious that we were collaborators. As I worked with them - and for the most part held back - I finally felt that they and I genuinely saw that we were working together to understand a complex reality. I earned a feeling of respect from that. It is also becoming increasingly obvious to me (1) THAT THESE IDEAS CANNOT BE CARRIED OUT WITHOUT CONTINUING SUPPORT IN THE SCHOOL and (2) that inservice teachers need long term education THAT IS EMOTIONALLY AS WELL AS INTELLECTUALLY SUPPORTIVE. These women had no idea what I meant on the syllabus by the term "knower", never mind coming to think of themselves OR their students as people with capacity to know, create and construct knowledge.

DAY 5

Today I brought in the video "First things first" and we viewed it in both classes. As we viewed it, I made a list of principal issues from the film, which focuses principally on (1) the crisis state in literacy; (2) the critical importance of parent & community involvement; and (3) the importance of language, voice and participation in meaning making as the path toward intellectual growth. The film comes down fairly hard on teachers who blame children for their failure. In the preservice class the film was well received, and despite some tangential comments, students focused pretty much on the main themes....

The inservice class was another story. They showed relatively little interest in my pre-viewing comments, which I cut short. They seem so burnt out!! They viewed the film fairly lethargically, but boy was the followup discussion frustrating!! They seemed to focus on anything EXCEPT the main themes! We began with a comment by F about some incident quite peripheral to the main theme, and they all harped on that, telling anecdotes, for a while. I shouldn't say all, because E , K and one or two more said nothing all class. The discussion then was steered by me to a main theme: the importance of community involvement. They criticized the film quite roundly on this point, and out came a long list of horror stories from J , G, A and C, esp., outlining how apathetic and uncaring their students' parents were. Of course the whole point of the film was to get away from these destructive stereotypes, but here they were - spouting them!. I challenged them that they were blaming the victim, and this only made matters worse, in that they got quite defensive with me. One of the main themes of the film was teacher responsibility - a point which seemed to make them feel too guilty to allow them to talk about the issue. How is one to deal with this LEVEL OF RESISTANCE? How does one (1) enable people to confront their selves constructively? (2) how do you enable teachers to

intellectualize - to see the big picture - of means and ends, of the relationship between patterns of actions and ultimate outcomes?

DAY 6 & 7

I gave out a"taking stock" sheet with a set of questions so that we might assess progress to date. As one might expect, the discussion really took off in the preservice class. They had an invigorating group discussion, and then proceeded to fill the board energetically with their responses....
The inservice class, as usual, presented significantly different problems. Before I even got an opprotunity to introduce "taking stock", I was attacked by F and G, abetted by J . They expressed anxiety about the assignments, the ambiguity of the course etc. I got fed up, and asserted that they were simply trying to evade their responsibilities with respect to the work. G demanded that I tell them exactly what they had to read for every class!! She needs total direction. F surprises me more, since her learning autobiography indicated that she was learning-oriented and self-directed. They couldn't get me to budge on Assignment 3, so then they attacked #4. I got mad. I refused to back down, and told them I resented them wasting the class's time like this. I said I doubted that everybody agreed, and indeed, many of the others later told me that they were perfectly happy with things as they are. N , in any case, proposed an intellectually honest compromise of combining #3 & #4 in an honest way. I agreed that this option was OK. I then put them to work on the assignment, and they became quite industrious, and actually conciliatory..... ...F , J , A , G and P dominated, though V made a notable contribution today - a great rush of words for her! C, E and S are very quiet (Why?) and K and N contribute modestly. They mostly chip in well in small groups. A lot of concern was expressed in this group too about the EMPOWERMENT ISSUE. My sense is that they are a very disempowered group - with perhaps a few exceptions. They feel THEY MUST DO WHAT THEY'RE TOLD. Not only that, they don't ask, so they could be a lot more rigid than their superiors expect! A common refrain is that the standardized tests cause serious constraints. Notable (this emerged from A) they are incredibly UNFAMILIAR WITH THE NOTION OF HAVING A PHILOSOPHY OF TEACHING!! Most said they have rarely if ever been asked to think about their purposes! Most have no conception of the kind of ideology underlying the curriculum (i.e, behaviorism, reproduction etc.). WITHOUT THIS, HOW CAN ONE POSSIBLY EXPECT A REFORMIST AGENDA?? Issues that came up when I explicitly asked for new voices to join us, were (1) THE EVALUATION ISSUE - though we did not explore it in detail in this class today; (2) CAN YOU DO IT AND STILL HAVE CONTROL -This is where V jumped in, claiming that teachers feel "that they have to have a reins on these kids". Most seem to agree, as the film said, that teachers fear the possibility of chaos. S, interestingly, referred to our evolving

conceptualization as "UNSTRUCTURED STUFF". I think that speaks volumes. Along with A in her biography, labelling it - and me- as radical!! V pointed out that it needs to be done, but, in view of the testing issues in schools, the prospects "ARE FRIGHTENING". DON'T THEY EVER think of the children's needs??? A , reflecting a fairly common sentiment perhaps, admitted that the philosophy under discussion, and even the VERY IDEA OF HAVING A PHILOSOPHY is totally new to her. Anway, what to make of all of this?? It is very hard to be definitive. I don't know what to think. Most of the discussion in this classroom is extremely CONCRETE. They rarely talk in principle, but go from anecdote to anecdote, often in tangents. Can't they ever talk IN PRINCIPLE. If they are not intellectuals, how can their students be? Am I helping them by allowing them therapeutically to set and pursue an agenda that seems very "soft and slow", or should I try to pull them toward the intellectual domain more - e.g., by sticking their noses into precise textual analysis. Where does impostion begin? When are they REALLY LEARNING??

DAY 8

As usual, the the preservice class exceeded my intellectual expectations. I started a formal reciprocal teaching process, and they did very well.... Overall, this class was again a pleasure. Virtually everybody joins in. They've begun to select topics for the final assignment with enthusiasm!! Of course, trooper that I am, I decided to follow the same route in the inservice class. I sat way back and observed:-

G - After my initial request that one of them come up, G asked if she should just come up and summarize something. I said no, that she had to teach in some other way. She said: "What do you mean 'teach'?" G then began by disclosing her own memorization/ competitive/ spit-out type of educational history. THEY ALL AGREED THAT THAT IS HOW THEY'VE LEARNED ALL THEIR LIFE. S, defending teachers, saids however that it was not the teachers' fault, it was the test-drivenness. P and A then went into an INTERMINABLE SERIES OF ANECDOTES ABOUT WHAT TESTS HAVE DONE IN SCHOOLS. - long, detailed expositions whose relevance to the topic was entirely unclear. HOW CAN ONE DIFFERENTIATE THIS TYPE OF STUFF FROM VOICE? IS THIS THERAPEUTIC? SHOULD I ENCOURAGE ANY KIND OF SHARING? HOW DOES ONE INTELLECTUALIZE AND DIRECT PEOPLE WITHOUT SILENCING OR IMPOSING?

F - F immediately launched into an attack on the book. She and K (who joined in) said they both preferred Duckworth. YET, WHEN DUCKWORTH WAS ON THE AGENDA, THEY NEVER OFFERED TO SHARE! F didn't agree with one of the instructions that Barnes gave for the air experiment. Therefore, she dismissed THE WHOLE BOOK. That anti-intellectualism pisses me off so much!!!

N - N said she'd only studied chapter one(of Barnes), but that she'd read it in detail. She summarized the entire chapter in one sentence to the effect that it was important not to stunt their growth - that they should be allowed to work things out for themselves. Everyone murmured agreement and that was that! I said that if there was agreement, what was there left to talk about? N wanted to sit down, but I urged her to stay. Focusing on the piece on 29, about placing control of learning ins students' hands, A responded that they have to be taught how to work in groups before you let them do it alone. She said that she thinks that she couldn't do it. S added that the students need to be mature enough, or else there will be chaos. HOW COME THEY NEVER STOP TO GIVE AN IDEA FAIR CONSIDERATION?? THIS LACK OF POWERELSSNESS TO VISUALIZE, OR TO DO THE INTELLECTUAL WORK NECESSARY TO VISUALIZE, IS REALLY A PROBLEM!! S repeatedly pleaded that we should focus on HOW THIS CAN BE DONE. When I said that there were many ideas in Barnes to address this, she, and many others, said they couldn't see them. In desperation, I had them actually read out a number of dialogues from the book to try to concretize the concepts enough for them to grab hold. First, with respect to The Bully Asleep (a child's poem in Barnes), A said that she thought those girls were very closed in their approach. The text, of course, argues the opposite. We studied the responses, and it turns out there was significant disagreement. Then I had an inspiration. I asked them to tell me what the poem itself meant. Turns out we had at least four competing interpretations floating around. It was amazing (FOR A KIDS POEM). Even after this, they had trouble seeing the point - i.e., the importance and legitimacy of multiple interpretations.. ONE OF THE CRUCIAL THINGS MISSING IN THIS CLASS IS INTELLECTUAL LEADERSHIP - WITH ONE OR TWO STUDENTS LIKE X, Y or Z from the preservice class WE'D PROBABLY BE FINE. The subsequent discussion revealed AN INCREDIBLE RESISTANCE TO GROUPING. How is one to deal with this type of resistance? What is its nature? I suspect anxiety about control, together with disempowerment are at its root. Ironically, in her next breath F quoted from 79-82 that the essential purpose of schooling was to get the knowledge from out there to in here in a meaningful way. However, although most seem to agree with this, the resistance in practice is phenomenal. I asked could anybody DO WHAT I DO? S said no. How am I to address this problem? In another attempt to concretize the issue, I had them enact the entire local trade example from Barnes. F did the teacher part very well. Subsequent discussion was fine as long as it consisted only of me reading out pieces and interpreting. After doing a few of these, I told them that this was not my role. Earlier, when I pulled G up short, when she used the word "we", and I pointed out that she may not be speaking for all of the students in the group, she got REALLY ANGRY WITH ME, AND COMPLAINED PUBLICLY ABOUT BEING PUT DOWN.

My abiding impressions?: Some of them seem CAPABLE Of THINKING ONLY IN TERMS OF LIFE EXPERIENCES AND ANECDOTES. This is an incredible obstacle. They cannot empathize, nor can they intellectualize. How does one grade and evaluate people who're doing this? Are they learning?

MY REACTIONS TO STUDENT JOURNALS IN INSERVICE CLASS:-
N - has written only 5 entries for first two weeks of class. Complains about ideas being IDEALISTIC, and says that she could use some ideas from whole lang. approach, but not all. "A teacher cannot always be overly creative" She said she still is primarily influenced by her parents, and with respect to reading, says "I CAN'T EXAMINE THINGS TOO DEEPLY". She found Freire "a little too profound." Saw the film as preaching parent responsibility, but she never addressed TEACHER RESPONSIBILITY - which is probably the key message of the film. She also complained, correctly I think, about the students who bellyache, and said that they will provide a very poor model of the learning process for their students. N desperately needs a thought-out philosophy of teaching- or at least a desire to inquire.

P - extremely disjointed, with no narrative stream atall. She pulled a bunch of ideas from the first two chapters of Duckworth, but never reinterpreted or elaborated on them. She identified her philosophy of teaching as toughlove, and recognized that I wouldn't like it. No question of self appraisal however. Totally preoccupied with self and the world as it is, with no critical reflection or any obvious attempt to make the ideas her own. Is she searching for anything either?

V - Relief! V actually read Duckworth critically and constructively, and raised some really nice questions. She didn't go so far as to make the knowledge her own in the sense of discussing practical outcomes, but otherwise it was very fine. She also pointed out that despite the protestations of others (e.g., G) I had made it clear w at we were to have read for given days. V is quite apologetic about herself as a learner, and admits to being confused, though she admits that the real problem is that in summer school you don't have the TIME TO BE CONFUSED! There's lots of potential for change here, and V seems to be seeking it out, though feeling rather unfocused.

F - Finally someone that's making sense of everything. F's journal was ideal. Intelligent reading, critical comments, and very useful translation into and comparison with her practice. I'm constantly puzzled by the difference between this F (in her biography too) and the F I see in class.

She did a journal entry on this, asking me if I disliked her. I explained no, and explained my frustration that someone who agrees with these ideas would serve as an inhibitor and spokesperson for the dissidents in class, rather than a catalyst for change and possibility. I also urged her to examine her attitude toward achievement, anxiety etc. Since she has a lot of potential and some trouble translating these ideas into practice, I offered to work with her in fall if she's interested. F obviously CARES deeply.

E - Good journal, with interesting insights, and an obvious sense that E is reading conscientiously and getting at least something from the reading. Unclear why she says so little in class, except that she said that she usually doesn't speak much until she's "comfortable." She has lots of good Qs and concerns if she'd only raise them in class. She obviously CARES deeply too.

K - Workaday kind of journal. She made comments indicating that she'd read, enjoyed and gained from reading Duckworth. Why doesn't she offer these ideas in class. She wrote a fascinating summary of her didactic learning history. Her work needs some critical self-questioning though. She has a very negative attitude to teaching some subject areas. Also says she has writing phobia.

S -A student who is definitely coming to the class looking for things that she can take back with her to the school setting. She very accurately describes how many of the others reacted to my syllabus: "Was there a reason for the syllabus being presented the way it was?It certainly had a profound effect on the students in the class. It made them crazy. It didn't bother me much. My attitude was 'let's give this guy a chance. I think the reason most of the people in the class were crazy is that we're so used to being TOLD what to do, and HOW to do it and a little bit of uncertainty threw them into a tizzy." S, who is about to graduate, confessed"It never occurred to me that in order to be a good teacher it is important to know (or have a philosophy of) what is learning." S's journal was a bit too short, though she did reread Freire and apparently benefited from the exercise. S seems to be clearly benefiting from the class in terms of articulating what she believes. However, she has lots of good exps. with whole language teaching etc. which she never shares in class. WHY?. Also, she seems to be getting very little from Barnes, and her notes from Duckworth are skimpy.

C - Surprise! A very perceptive journal. C asks wonderful questions and offers great insights. WHY DOESN'T SHE OFFER THESE IN CLASS? Regarding

the bellyaching, she observes: "I think it's a bit scary that the behavior of the teachers (peers) were no different than the children of today. WHY DO WE NEED TO DO ALL THIS WORK? WHY DO WE NEED TO LEARN? WE DON'T HAVE THE TIME TO COMPLETE THE WORK BECAUSE WE HAVE A LIFE AFTER SCHOOL. My students told me the same things (she quotes..) Our priorities are a bit mixed up. What happened to 'hard work leads to a better mind'?" She goes on then to recount in her art teaching how, when she adopted this philosophy, students at first resisted, but, after about two years of socialization, were producing sterling creative work. Regarding those of her fellow students whom she regards as burnouts, C wonders if indeed they were ever like her - curious, questioning learners. She also raises lots of thoughtful questions about the reasons why education is so poorly managed and funded. C offered a very perceptive analysis of why what's been happening in the class. I think she may well be right, by the way, that my type of course is intrinsically unsuited to summer session because the compressed schedule leaves so little time for reflection.... But yet, look at my current the preservice class!! Perhaps it is unsuited to people who have such deep-seated problems anbd biased perceptions as so many of these students have.

G - Mainly preoccupied with her own feelings as a learner in this uncertain environment, as well as her frustration with my response to her. She set herself up as spokesperson for the group, and as a result, I undoubtedly became a bit hostile toward the sabotage that she and F were doing. (more below on this). Other than that, her journal is work-a-day, but fairly superficial, without much evidence that she has done a lot with the reading. I think her real problem is a study one - she simply reads superficially, quite the oposite of what we read about in the Freire piece.

J - Journal not really reflective in any way. No obvious desire to engage in self-appraisal. Most devastating is lack of evidence that J is capable of listening to people or text, taking ideas on their merits, and at least thinking about them as possibilities. She constantly says she's for "open" schools, yet I doubt it. She also has very low expectations of parents, and of students from poor or "disadvantaged" backgrounds of any kind. This really needs examination. She and P have a personality clash in class that is also very destructive.

A - To some extent much the same could be said of A . however, A is tuning in to what is going on so she has more potential. She does seem to have an instinct for it. She seems to understand what I'm trying to do, and also understands how hard it is for people with her learning history to do it. As she says on the first entry, "I feel unsteady about this course's

expectations. I'M USED TO BEING GIVEN THE ASSIGNMENTS, CLEAR PARAMETERS, then I know how to handle it. THIS IS HOW THE GAME IS USUALLY PLAYED and I always do well."!@!!!@@!! Later A produced an entry headed "trust" in large letters. "The first few days Michael [= me!] repeatedly said he wasn't trying to "trick" us - but I was skeptical. HE SOUNDED A LOT LIKE NIXON WHEN HE SAID "I AM NOT A CROOK". However, as trust developed, she said "for once, there was no ONE right idea. Each had merit because it was substantiated by facts, ideas and personal experience of each student. And so I am secure enough to know that for this assignment (first autobiography) at least there is no right or wrong answer - only personal insight which only I can truly judge." Finally, her journal INDICATES IN A COMPELLING WAY HOW SOME OF THE OLDER STUDENTS HAVE BEGUN TO USE THE CLASS AS A THERAPEUTIC ENVIRONMENT. This is indeed the problem.

A final footnote:-
G and F came to see me to discuss their project, and we had a very frank discussion about the situation in the class. Without going into details, I framed the problem of one of me ENLISTING THEIR SUPPORT TO ACCELERATE THE INTELLECTUAL FOCUS AND SENSE OF DIRECTION OF THE CLASS. They have agreed to do this, and it will be interesting to see what happens on Mon. I also have sent some messages inviting participation to some of the students who are silent but have potential (E , C, K, V), and have sent messages encouraging a more listening attitude to J , P and A .

DAY 9
In the inservice class I gave back the journals. I also told them that there was wisdom in their journals and suggested that more of them might share the wealth. C (one of the wise but silent) said that she was quiet because she finds it difficult to talk in front of groups of adults. F , in keeping with our conversation, quoted very nicely from 172, about the importance of self-examination for teachers, and how she felt that was my purpose - to get them to search for their philosophies of teaching. What followed was a **POSITIVELY ANIMATED discussion** of the issue of TRUST, and the need for teachers to engage in self-disclosure. A derailed this one eventually. F (good soul!) then raised the "Don't smile until Xmas" issue - for reasons I can't recall. C agreed with F , but N said that she agreed with the expression, and what followed was a sometimes interesting, sometimes digressed discussion about a teacher being a friend, versus loving, versus caring for students. In an attempt to refocus the discussion, I asked what was the "essential core of teaching"? Deb. - growth; V - nature of learning; S - growth; J - prep. for life; A - growth; C - see a difference in their learning - watch them "SPONGE IT IN". After C said the latter, I

remarked on her metaphor, and she tried to disclaim it. Because C had such nice stuff in her journal, I asked her to elaborate on her art teaching exp. She did it very nicely, and illustrated concretely how she had applied basically the same open principles we've been discussing. She also discussed how she's had some success applying it in all subjects except math. This prompted V to join in with suggestions for how you might do the same kind of group work in math. C also usefully pointed out how it takes time AND TRUST, and that it was at least three months before students trusted her enough to take a risk. To continue focusing the discussion on intellectual matters, I invited K, and also F , to share their reasons for being very excited after reading Duckworth. They particularly liked the insight she gave into the nature of children's learning - a view of the PROCESS. F also liked how Piaget was concretized and explicated. V then made a lovely contribution, by sharing her perspective on Duckworth's Ch. 6 on error. I elaborated on this, highlighting the distinction between informative and evaluative feedback. K delighted me by identifying in B, the phrase having to do with "arriving without travelling" as the essential message. V , concluding with a focus on how children learn in so many styles, pointed out how group work is so useful int his process.
All in all, the preservice class was sluggish today, but the inservice class was at its most intellectual, Was it P'S ABSENCE, MY CHANGED ATTITUDE AFTER READING THEIR JOURNALS, THE HELP OF F , OR THE COMMENTS I PROVIDED ON THEIR JOURNALS? E was still quiet today, but all others were active participants. Some success at last!!

DAY 10

TODAY, TO BROADEN THEIR HORIZONS, I BROUGHT IN "RETHINKING SCHOOLS" (newspaper), AND SOME POEMS AND HANDOUTS, AND DISTRIBUTED THEM IN CLASS.

In the preservice class, the morning began with me asking them to list as many as possible of the main assumptions behind Didactic and Critical or transformative approaches to pedagogy. For the remainder of the class we did the "twelve motivation questions", as a way of providing an entree to that subject. Despite the heat, motivation and interest was high.
In the inservice class, the main topic of interest was the Belenkv paper [Ch. 10 from Women's ways of knowing]. I thought we were off to a very poor start when I asked if anyone had strong feelings either way about Belenky, and NOBODY HAD!! However, these people are starting to catch on. They all merely agreed at first that it reiterated Barnes and Duckworth. TALK ABOUT A CLOSED DISCUSSION!! With gentle encouragement, and me interrupting J , A and P whenever they gyrated too much into the realm of anecdotes, people started talking. A raised the interesting issue of doubt on 227 - and how it may be better to foster than challenge in order to gain growth. G -

pointed out on 226 the importance of not assuming that the students exp. the material the way we do. E did a great job today. She selected the piece on 223 about BRIDGING PRIVATE AND SHARED EXP. She also pointed out on 221 how GROUPING can alow students to "nurture each others thoughts to maturity". F raised some issues about this but V defended the idea very articulately. I raised the question: "In this class do we nurture each other's learning?. There followed a long and **animated** (YEA!!) discussion about precisely what nurturing meant. Some disliked the "touchy-feely" connotations of the term, while A suggested that it really meant being NONJUDGMENTAL. S suggested that it really could be reduced to an ethic of CARING. F , playing her leadership role, made a nice connection to Duckworth, as did K . J then raised the issue of trusting students. A raised the issue from 115, of risk-taking with students, and asked how could this apply in elem. schl. V PROVIDED a math example to clarify, and I gave some others. C very nicely explicated the MIDWIFE METAPHOR. F nicely identified the essence of caring as not friendship, but as being "totally and nonselectively available to students". She cross-referenced this very nicely with Laura's definition from yesterday of loving students. The class concluded with an extensive discussion of SILENT CHILDREN. I pushed them really hard to try to consider silent children as lacking voice, and to beware of self-fulfilling prophecies. We only scratched the surface on this one.

What can I say? **The commentary tells its own story. IT LOOKS LIKE WE ARE FINALLY ENGAGED IN THE COLLABORATIVE MAKING OF MEANING. WHAT A JOURNEY!! The students finally seem oriented to rasing questions and helping each other generate interesting answers.**

DAY 11

Today I distributed "Cowpath" [poem about taking "the road less travelled"]. In the preservice class we discussed Belenky, then went on to start motivation, and in the inservice class, we started on motivation via Newsweek commentary by Paula Skreslet. In the preservice class I proposed that we begin with a speak-about, in which people in turn would raise issues or offer comments or questions. We had a very useful dialogue in which 17 different people participated. Overall, despite intense heat, fatigue and end-of-term pressure, most students are reading diligently, and are genuinely groping for meaning.

In the preservice class we launched directly into the Skreslet commentary (a piece very critical of extrinsic rewards in school). The students took a real initiative in getting into groups today. A was absent, and the others quickly formed two groups, isolating J and P, who had to form a dyad on their own! The two large groups had very productive discussions, and I came

around and joined in. People like F , who do not teach in that way, have real trouble imagining that the real world is like that! P and J , of course, spent most of the time trading anecdotes. We then convened as a large class group, and F , taking a leadership role, asked me to elaborate on my views about stickers etc. and to clarify the difference between recogniton and contingent rewards. She has good leadership skills! G left early, so I don't know what she would have done - though she seems much more at ease. In fact, apart from H, B & J the class has become very tranquil and collaboratively task-oriented. ... The discussion then turned to a teacher's responsibility with respect to motivation, with many arguing that teachers indeed bore this responsibility. J , of course, wanted to blame the homes. SELF FULFILLING PROPHECIES ARE THE WORST !! I read my Playboy piece (on "invisible children"), in both classes too. What surprises me is how willing some teachers are to blame the students as victims, and to have NO EMPATHY, NEVER MIND OUTRAGE. P also tried to put it across that all city schools are environments in which teachers have no power, and would have gotten away with this only for I asked others if that was their exp. too. C argued against it, and so did others. I find it astonishing, after all we've talked about, that BLAMING THE VICTIM COMES FIRST. There was virtual unanimity that the case studies on motivation [distributed in class] are helpful, and we will discuss these tomorrow.

[STUDENTS TEACHING THE CLASS ON TOPICS OF THEIR CHOICE FROM NOW ON]

DAY 12

In the inservice class the first two students addressed the issue of sex roles in school. They first did a short boy-girl-teacher role play, then asked all of the women to draw a scientist. Then they asked them to identify 3 men and 3 women that were most influential in history, Then they issued a questionnaire. Their two largest shortcomings were (1) a tendency to talk too much, particularly in an attempt to explicate; and (2) they didn't get much mileage out of the activities they gave out, because they didn't systematically follow up on any one of them. For the famous women, most couldn't (wouldn't??) generate three, and the only person one student could think of was OPRAH WINFREY!! One of the students leading the discussion , getting a poor response to her Qs, called the class a BUNCH OF DEADHEADS [I later gave her fedback on better ways to communicate her feelings, though I could empathize!]. E , P and K offered some inconsequential ideas. Much was revealed hoverver when V spoke. To begin with, she stated that BOYS ARE LIKE ANIMALS WHILE GIRLS ARE NOT AGGRESSIVE. As the discussion progressed, P shifted the topic to the general issue of gender inequities, and explained how, when she resumed work and also came back to school, she had to apologize to her whole family because now some of the chores would be done by hired help! She said, much

as Newsweek does this week, that EQUALITY IS NOW TRANSLATED INTO TWO JOBS FOR WOMEN. V , picking up on this, in a rush of passion, tried to articulate her own POWERLESSNESS, ANGER AND FRUSTRATION. She said that WOMEN WORK SO HARD AND GET SO BITTER (BECAUSE OF UNEQUAL TREATMENT - SHE HAS TO LOOK AFTER THE WHOLE FAMILY, AND CLEAN A LARGE HOUSE) THAT MANY WOMEN NO LONGER FEEL LIKE WOMEN, THEY'RE "ITS". S asked V how she was raising her sons. V replied that she has heard her husband use the term "you're a woman with them" to imply weakness and uselessness. Her's was quite a cathartic disclosure. She concluded - generalizing from her own exp. - "women have been stepped on! Women live in fear!". Her statement touched a nerve, perhaps of sympathy, and also fear and discomfort at what was being revealed. Everybody started speaking at once (what an experience!!). F tried to stop the discussion, saying that we had veered off topic, and also that V had gone too much into her personal life. I interrupted, suggesting that if V wanted to speak about it, perhaps she should, and that it was pertinent to school issues, since it reflected the home reality of many children. P, another sufferer, seemed to have the greatest empathy with V , while J , in a very blunt way, suggested that she simply ditch her husband. After that the discussion moved back, due to K & D's steering, into the arena of teacher roles [Can one take women like V to a higher intellectual plane if these painful memories are not first addressed?].

For the remainder of the class we talked, but with minimal enthusiasm, about the case studies in motivation. Since they all professed liking these, and since the case studies are eminently practical, I had hoped for more. C started us off on a very positive note by saying that she was just like the teacher in Ch. 7. Yet, it's a puzzle. C will hardly ever speak in class, won't self-disclose, and doesn't reveal any enthusiasm for these values when they come up in class. I mentioned the concept of spiraling, which is nicely discussed in the final case study. This led P into an interminable discussion about the spiral curriculum used in her school district. All that this revealed was P's inability to conceive of curriculum except in terms of syllabus, and that children's needs count for nought. She told a story of one student who refused to do multiplication and also refused remedial help, and so was passed on as a failure. F and I both challenged her really hard to begin to see it as a structural problem rather than a blame the victim problem. With what success??

I had a most unusual encounter after class. A came to the office, extremely nervous and hesitant. She beat around the bush for a few minutes, but finally spoke. The gist of her conversation was that this class has been a dramatic developmental exp. for her. A colleague sowed the seed last semester [in another class], and now she's really taken off. She was so excited and EMPOWERED one night, that she wanted to phone me at home!

However, she began as one of the extremely anxious ones, and is privy to their confidence. She said, that in their pre-class caucus, at least six of them have taken the attitude that the only way they can get through this class is to play the game but put in the minimum of effort. They have decided to hold down the level of the class by a strategy, of NOT ENGAGING. She said also that there was considerable resentment among some of them that although I said that their journals would not be evaluated (I really need to rephrase my policy on that), that they had received negative feedback. {What am I supposed to do with those who write superficially and un-self-critically? Ignore it? WHAT IS MY OBLIGATION IN ALL OF THIS??} Despite my telling them that I'm keeping a journal, they are also very concerned about my taking notes in class. WHY ALL THIS CONCERN? IS IT MERE PERFORMANCE ORIENTED CONCERN OR COULD IT BE THAT I'VE CREATED AN EVALUATION-ORIENTED ENVIRONMENT IN SPITE OF MY BEST INTENTIONS??? WHY IS IT SO DAMN HARD FOR THEM TO BE HONEST, EITHER PUBLICLY IN CLASS, OR ELSE IN PRIVATE WITH ME AFTERWARD?? WHY THE NEED TO CAUCUS? J , picking up on something I had said in the other class, also told them that I thought this class was much poorer or some such. She's really destructive and trying to manipulate the group to protect herself. I would guess that P's doing likewise. In any case, A wrote a short story demonstrating the plight of a teacher, faced with students WHO DON'T WANT TO ABANDON THE COMFORT OF THEIR ONE WAY OF KNOWING, AND WHO WILL DO ANYTHING TO PLEASE THE TEACHER, but yet the teacher wants them to face the importance of examining the world multiplistically. ON REFLECTION, I REALIZE THE PERSPICACITY OF A'S EXPOSITION. SHE HAS ILLUSTRATED THE APPARENT BASIC DUALISM IN WHICH SO MANY OF THESE MATURE GRAD. STUDENTS SEEM TO BE EMBEDDED. The necessity to do formal research on this issue is indeed pressing. It also illustrates the importance of developmentally-oriented education, and raises my current greatest preoccupation: HOW DO YOU ASSIGN GRADES TO PEOPLE LIKE THIS??
[THIS WHOLE DISCUSSION RAISES ONCE AGAIN THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE OF THE RESISTANCE OF TEACHERS TO BEING INTELLECTUALS, AND THIS, COMBINED WITH PERFORMANCE ANXIETY, POWERLESSNESS AND THERAPEUTIC NEEDS PRESENTS FORMIDABLE OBSTACLES TO ANYONE INTERESTED IN FOSTERING GENUINE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AMONG TEACHERS - TO PUT IT SIMPLY, HOW CAN YOU HAVE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH WITHOUT INTELLECTUAL INTROSPECTION AND CRITICAL SELF-EXAMINATION ABOUT ISSUES GERMANE TO YOUR OWN BELIEFS AND PRACTICE? ANYONE WHO THINKS YOU CAN IS SIMPLY LOOKING FOR EASY ANSWERS IN MY VIEW.].

DAY 13

Today, in the preservice class, we showed Purkey's video [a speech on

"Invitational, learning"], and then went to on to group teaching.
In the inservice class, because they were nervous, the presenters preceded the Purkey film, which ran right up to the end of the schedule, and hence there was no room for discussion. The student leaders chose as their topic "belief systems in science and math". By beleif systems they meant that how we perceive the subject will influence how we teach/learn it....
...one of them then presented an apples and peaches problem which was intended to demonstrate how students feel when confronted with challenges. In the end it became sort of jumbled. The other then beautifully introduced a live caterpillar, described her own insect phobia, and how she nevertheless managed to turn the caterpillar into an excellent teaching subject. She emphasized HOW YOU HAVE TO BECOME CONSCIOUS OF YOUR OWN BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES BEFORE YOU CAN CHANGE. {I often wonder if, when they state and assent to such wisdom, they see any connection between it and what I'm trying to do with them??}. She then posed the Q of why they don't like to teach math and science. G said she feels that "she doens't know enough". She also asked: HOW DO YOU TEACH MATH/SCI.? She confessed that she teaches mainly through recitation because she's so uptight about the subject.. S then shared how she developed a very nice nature center in her room. It was hard work, but it paid off in that it really motivated the students. V , says that in sixth grade math is perceived as boring, and the mere mention of "word problems" throws kids into panic. V said that TO HER MATH IS A LANGUAGE IN ITSELF, THAT NEEDS TO BE TAUGHT, AND THAT TEACHERS MUST SERVE AS ROLE MODELS FOR LEARNING. P then embarked on a story about a teacher who taught by project methods in science, yet her kids did not pick up enough science vocab. to pass the standardized tests. J contributed a suggestion, and F shared that her kindergarteners have learned the term "metamorphosis". J came out with the amazing statment" "SOCIAL STUDIES ARE MORE MEMORIZATION, WHILE MATH AND SCIENCE ARE MORE MANIPULATIVES". THIS IS ABOUT THE INVERSE OF THE USUAL STEREOTYPE, and indeed it shows how much work J has to do in deconstructing curriculum concepts. It was briefly, but not effectively challenged, and we were running out of time. The two students concluded with two very useful handouts describing some of the myths assoc. with math and science, which unfortunately we didn't have time to discus. Overall, class today was comfortably participative, and very much directed by the teachers themselves. They also professed to like the Purkey film.

DAY 14

In the inservice class three students were first up with a session on self-esteem. If anything, this group was overprepared, with so much material that not much of it could be explored in depth. First they

role-played one student's experience as a teacher's aide, dealing with a boy named G, who was in the class in which she was a teaching assistant - a boy for whom the teacher had low expectations., and who really believed what she said about him. The second student then read out a descriptive report on her case, W, a student in her fourth grade class. The remaining two students then role played a student-student interaction. Descriptive material on both was handed out, as well as photos and questions. Unfortunately, little time was provided to read and respond systematically. However, a good general discussion followed. J , responding to my Q, said that if she were faced with a similar situation after having taken this class, she would use groups more, be more understanding, label less and focus less on the curriculum. Quite an advance for her to be able to reflect like this. E said that her main inspiration for change comes from Barnes. P responded first by narrating about her school, a place in which her students "would never be the soldiers the school wanted them to be." Growing reflective, she said that she FEELS MORE SUCCESSFUL AND LESS VICTIMIZED, AND THAT SHE REALIZES NOW THAT THERE ARE TOOLS OUT THERE THAT CAN BE USED. She now realizes, for the very first time, that BEHAV. MOD. TAKES POWER AWAY FORM KIDS. [AREN'T WE REALLY TALKING TEACHER EMPOWERMENT WHEN P SPEAKS LIKE THIS??] Interestingly, she not only said she'd like to be part of a support group in fall, in conversation with me, but she publicly acknowledged this in class today. The atmosphere relaxed quite well, and I asked if they now find this kind of learning experience helpful. F said that she would EAT HUMBLE PIE and admit that it was.

In the second session, three students did an excellent session on writing process. One began with a nice summary of the issues, and a nice quote from Calkins. This was followed by the enactment of a typical writing scenario, using Chris Van Allsburg's "Jumanji" as stimulus. I was really surprised at the grasp they had of this issue. Two of these students have taught this way, and they conveyed the essence of the approach very well indeed. I learned a lot from the session myself. It elicited good participation and involvement from the group. Afterward V came to me privately to complain about how C had hogged the session the day before and how she herself felt completely excluded and voiceless. I had noticed this, but not at all to the extent to which it had happened. C had apparently acquitted herself well at V's expense.

DAY15 - LAST CLASS!!!!

In the preservice class it really was business as usual, with a packed schedule of presentations.

My inservice class was the usual enigma. The one student who was leading started off with a very functional, simple and appealing (to the

students) lesson on approaches to questioning. She did a very competent job indeed. Two nice demos of two approaches, followed by a handout summarizing approaches to questioning. She said: "question asking is a big risk for students. If we want schools to be centers of inquiry, we must make it easy" She concluded by inviting the other students to comment on her performance - a nice touch.

I then asked for feedback on the course or discussion on any other topic, since we had an hour left. SILENCE! It was extremely dificult. While a few came and thanked me at the end, most seemed to still feel the kind of uneasiness they had experienced the first day. It was EMBARRASING. I got no cohesive discussion going, and we quit 20 minutes early. I had a long discussion with S afterward, and she will likely be a second person for my support group/ case study in fall. G however did turn the tables on me, and asked me HOW THE CLASS WENT FROM MY PERSPECTIVE. I then spoke frankly about the different needs of pre- and inservice teachers, about THE IMPORTANCE OF SELF-EXAMINATION AND HOW I FELT THAT IT WAS VITAL TO GROWTH.

Concluding note: All comments and reactions in the foregoing were written at the time the class was taught. I am currently engaged in a retrospective analysis of the meaning of these events in light of the theoretical position presented in this paper, as well as the implications of these events for how we go about the critical education of teachers.

Notes

1.In collaboration with colleagues at Hofstra University, Beaver College and Michigan State University I am engaged in a longitudinal journal study of the evolution of teacher beliefs. See Niemeyer and Moon (1990), Schultz and Schmidt, (1990) and Rust (1990) for preliminary reports. I have just completed a proposal to begin a longitudinal study assessing the epistemological orientation, orientation toward authority and implicit and explicit pedagogical beliefs of student teachers.

2. All citations are from the 1989 edition of Pedagogy of the oppressed, published by Continuum.

References

Ahlquist, R. & O'Loughlin, M. (1990, April). Teaching reading for empowerment: Critical literacy for diverse voices. Keynote address presented at the Twenty Third Annual Conference of the College Reading and Learning Association, Irvine, CA.

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988). Ideological dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking. London: Sage Publications.

Britzman, D. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biography and social structure in teacher education. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 442-456.

Freire, P. (1972/1989) Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum [Originally published by Penguin Books, 1972].

Greene, M. (1988). The dialectic of freedom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Niemeyer, R. & Moon, A. (1990, April). Evolving beliefs about teaching and learning: The view from Michigan State University. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

O'Loughlin, M. (1988a). Reconceptualizing educational psychology to facilitate teacher empowerment and critical reflection. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Association for the Teaching of Educational Psychology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

O'Loughlin, M. (1988b). A problem-posing approach to pedagogy in teacher education. Paper presented at the Tenth Annual Conference on Curriculum Theory and Classroom Practice, Bergamo Conference Center, Dayton, Ohio.

O'Loughlin, M. (1989a, June). The influence of teachers' beliefs about knowledge, teaching and learning on their pedagogy: A constructivist reconceptualization and research agenda for teacher education. Paper presented at the Nineteenth Annual Symposium of the Jean Piaget Society, Philadelphia, PA.

O'Loughlin, M. (1989b). An introduction to critical pedagogy. Paper presented at the Ninth Annual and Seventh International Conference on Critical Thinking and Educational Reform, Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, Sonoma State University, California.

O'Loughlin, M. (1990, April).Evolving beliefs about teaching and learning: The view from Hofstra University. I. A perspective on teachers'

beliefs. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

O'Loughlin, M. & Campbell, M. (1988). Teacher preparation, teacher empowerment and reflective inquiry: A critical perspective. Teacher Education Quarterly, 15, 25-54. Reprinted in Education and Society, (1988), 6, 54-70.

Perry, W.G. (1970). Intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Rust, F. O'C. (1990, April). An analysis of beliefs about teaching among presrvice teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Schultz, J. & Schmidt, J. (1990, April). Evolving beliefs about teaching and learning: The view from Beaver College. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Shor, I. (Ed.). (1987). Freire for the classroom: A sourcebook for liberatory teaching. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann/ Boynton Cook.

Insert table here

Appendix I: Course syllabus for graduate class

Advanced Child Development for Teachers
Summer 19**
[Identifying information removed]

Required texts

Barnes, D. (1975). From communication to curriculum. Middx. Eng.: Penguin Books,

Duckworth, E. (1987). "The having of wonderful ideas" and other essays on teaching and learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stipek, D. (1988). Motivation to learn: From theory to practice. Englewood, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Note: Additional reading material is on reserve in the library, or will be made available in class.

Purpose of class:

Consider the following quotes, both of which are drawn from the Duckworth book that we will read:

"By teacher I mean someone who engages learners, who seeks to involve each person wholly - mind, sense of self, sense of humor, range of interests, interactions with other people - in learning. And, having engaged the learners, a teacher finds his questions to be the same as those that a researcher into the nature of human learning wants to ask: What do you think and why? While the students learn, the teacher learns too. And it helps if, like Paley (1986), he is curious about the students' thoughts. How do other people really think about these matters? Which ideas build upon which others and how? Which interests build on which other interests? Which ideas get in the way of other ideas? What seem to be in Hawkins's (1979) phrase, the "critical barriers" in this field? How is an idea modified? How does a firmly held conviction influence how a person reads an experience?... What factors keep interest high?... How does a new idea lead to a new question, and vice versa?" (p. 134)

"I am proposing that teaching, understood as engaging learners in phenomena and working to understand the sense they are making, might be the sine qua non of research.

That kind of researcher would be a teacher in the sense of caring about some part of the world and how it works enough to want to make it accessible to others; he or she would be fascinated by the questions of how to engage people in it and and how people make sense of it..." (140).

My goal in this course is to help you address the three central issues raised above, namely (1) the fact that children are active, constructive knowers who have the power to learn, to know and to understand; (2) that the essential challenge of teaching is to recognize this, and to find ways to engage learners in their own learning; and (3) to be a truly great teacher, a teacher needs to be a researcher, in the sense of having an undying curiosity about the world, about how people make sense of it, and about how to engage them in it.

Format of the course

This is your class. I am here to facilitate your learning. My goal is to create a learning environment that is relevant and meaningful for you. If at any time you find that the course is not meeting your interests, please do not hesitate to discuss this with me. I would like you to view this class as a growth or developmental experience for you. I would like to give you an opportunity to have your own understanding of yourself grow and develop over the period of the course. I will try to structure the assignments and the evaluation system to reflect these values.

The class will be fundamentally dialogical in format, with most of the time devoted to reaction, reflection, discussion, problem posing and critical exploration. Since much of the learning that will happen, will occur during classroom dialogue, it will be very difficult for you to succeed in the class if (1) you do not come to class prepared or (2) if you miss class. Attendance, evidence of preparation, and willingness to participate actively in class will figure in your final grade.

As I noted earlier, this is your class. I am here to facilitate your learning. I will try to create a non-threatening, supportive atmosphere in which you can reach out and try some new ideas. Don't be afraid to join in and express your views - it is only by taking a risk and trying out your tentative ideas that you will learn and grow. If, however, at any time you feel lost in the class, feel frustrated with with the class structure, feel that you are not learning etc., please be sure to speak with me. I will make any adjustments that I can to enhance your learning experience.

Course schedule

This class represents a new departure for me. Typically, I give out a detailed syllabus of readings and dates at the first class meeting. However, this time I would like to experiment with creating a learning collective. I would like us to set our priorities together with respect to what we should address and when. I have assigned three books, and I have an extensive file of supplementary material that I can make available as your interests become more defined. A general sequence that might work, perhaps would be to begin with the Duckworth book, dealing with the nature of children's thinking and the importance of intellectualism and "the having of wonderful ideas" in schools; to move on from there to the Barnes book, with its discussion of precisely how to implement a dialogical and intellectual curriculum in schools; to go on then to discuss implications of these ideas for specific subject areas (with you, students, signing up for and reporting on one specific area of interest - e.g., the teaching of reading, writing, math, science etc.); to move on next to the general issue of motivation and our study of the Stipek book; and finally, to leave some time for topics of general interest such as discipline, effects of poverty,

racial and gender inequities, effects of stress, effects of standardized testing etc., depending on student interest (again, some students may wish to sign up to address these topics). In all cases, readings will be made available that pose the issues from a developmental and critical perspective.

Assignments

Since we will be making collective decisions about the direction in which we wish the class to go, it would be presumptous of me to dictate the assignments in advance. However, the following represent the kinds of assignments that I believe would be beneficial for you, though the assignments are of course subject to negotiation.

1. Reflective journal

There will be a reading assignment for each class. In order to benefit from the reading and the ensuing class discussion, it is essential that you read prior to class, and that you come to class with a short set of questions or problems to pose, based on your reading. These should be included in your journal each night, with the date and topic written at the top. Your journal is also the place for reflection on the issues that have been raised in class, and indeed, on what is actually happening in class. I would also like to see you use your journal in a genuinely biographical way - reflecting on the implications of the ideas about education that you are hearing for your understanding of your own past as a learner, your present as a learner and teacher, and your future as a learner and teacher. Guidlines on precisely how to keep a journal of this type are in the chapter by Toby Fulwiler, which is on reserve in the library. Please read the Fulwiler paper as soon as possible.

Due date:: I will read your journals periodically throughout the semester.

2. Autobiography of your own learning history

You will reflect on the influences that shaped you into becoming the knower that you are today. What events in your early childhood, in your elementary and secondary schooling, in your college years, and in your interpersonal relations with others created the vision of yourself as knower that you now hold. Who colored your attitude to achievement? In what way? Who gave you the view of intellectual endeavor that you now hold? How have these influences affected you? How have you responded to counteract negative or discouraging influences? How are these influences reflected in your current ambition to become a teacher? Do a chronological timeline first, then try to pick out major themes across your lifeline, and present the results in a brief autobiographical essay, due the end of the first week of class.

Due date: July 17.

3. Philosophy of teaching autobiography

For this piece of autobiographical writing, I would like you to reflect on the forces that influenced you to become a teacher. Be sure to engage particularly with your memories of your actual experience of schooling. Please talk about what teacher's work is, and what you see your mission as a teacher to be. If you are already teaching, or have been, please engage in critical reflection on not only what you do/did every day, but on what the assumptions underlying your actions appear/ed to be. Finally, now that we're well into the course, begin to piece together a personal philosophy of teaching with evidence that you're working at embracing some of the ideas that have come up in discussion and in the readings and that you are attempting to make them your own. Please present the end result of your reflections in a brief autobiographical paper which captures what you stand for as a teacher.

Due date: July 24.

4. Critical reflection on book from assigned list

Choose one of the three assigned books. Think about the book, its mesage and the questions it raises for you. Then, please draft up either a brief critical statement indicating precisely why you chose this book, and drawing from the book to illustrate your position, or else present a set of thought-provoking questions that the book raises for you. You may, if you wish, do a combined exercise, in which you do either of these assignemnts across two, or even all three books.

Due date: July 27

5. Exploration of a subject area of your choice

As well as studying the common syllabus, you will be given the opportunity to sign up for an in-depth exploration of a topic of your choice relevant to elementary education and child development. Possible topics include the teaching of language arts, social studies, math, science, reading, writing etc., and issues such as the effects of stress, poverty, racial and gender inequities etc. on learning and development. Part of your responsibility (working in a team with some others) will be to explore the topic in some depth and then to figure out how to introduce the topic to the other students in the class in some pedagogically interesting way [Lecturing not allowed!!]. I will be available for an in-depth conference with each group, and I will provide you with suggested readings and other advice as necessary. As a final paper, each member of the group will develop a position paper, summarizing the nature and importance of the issue that was explored; explaining what was found out from the research;

summarizing the relevance of this information for the practice of teaching; and concluding with a self-assessment of (1) what you gained form doing the research; and (2) what you gained from teaching the material to your colleagues. Your grade will be based on evidence of preparation; effectiveness of classroom activity; and final report.

Due date: August 2.

Please note: Due to the compressed nature of summer schedule, papers are expected on due date.